A U M

He who knows others is clever, but he who knows himself is enlightened. He who overcomes others is strong, but he who overcomes himself is mightier still. He is rich who knows when he has enough. He who acts with energy has strength of purpose. He who moves not from his proper place is long lasting. He who dies, but perishes not, enjoys true longevity.
—LAO TZE.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXV August, 1937 No. 10

GENETIC YEARS

THE loss of faith—faith in anything—which is characteristic of our age, has had a profound effect upon that great current of human activity and expression which we call "religious." With the exception of Catholicism, the religions of the western world have reached a stage where conventional creeds have little or no significance to the average man. The practical influence of the modern church is in almost every case the sole result of individual clergymen who maintain congregations as personal followings. As doctrine and dogma collapse in the wake of scientific discovery, Christianity is revealed in a state of comparative nudity. Religion today is little more than a "benevolent feeling"—a humanism without philosophic structure or moral restraint.

Now that thoughtful men are beginning to realize that Science, which was to replace religion, is inadequate as a pattern for harmonious human relations, a change which has been especially evident in recent years, we hear on every hand the call to return to "faith." Just what faith we shall return to is something of a mystery. It is inevitable that the deep surge of devotion in the human heart will find some channel of expression with the rise of the cycle. In *Isis Unveiled* (I, 36), H. P. Blavatsky wrote:

> *Human nature is like universal nature in its abhorrence of a vacuum.* It feels an intuitional yearning for a Supreme Power. Without a God, the cosmos would seem to it but like a soulless corpse. . . . Mankind have one innate, irrepressible craving, that *must* be satisfied in any religion that would supplant the dogmatic, undemonstrated and undemonstrable theology of our Christian ages.

While Theosophists work that this religious renascence may turn to a faith founded on knowledge, to a scientific basis for ethics, the alternatives to this high objective are already in evidence. Even now many are entering on the path which leads to "the deliberate surrender of intellect and its imprisonment in the narrow grooves of bigotry and superstition—a process which cannot fail to lead to the utter deformation of the intellectual principle . . . "—as was foretold by a Master of Wisdom.

Because science has destroyed the moral *compulsion* which religion provided, some reformers see no hope except through ignoring science and returning to the old orthodoxy of blind faith. Dr. Henry C. Link, director of the Psychological Service Center of New York City, indicts modern "liberal education" as responsible for the decline of religious convictions, describing it as the "most destructive" influence in America. (New York *Times*, May 18.) His attack on the so-called "liberal mind" is a direct impeachment of the scientific method as a theory of knowledge.

> It is [he says] the mind systematically cultivated to question the traditions and morals of the past; the mind habituated to doubt the old and to place credence in the new; the mind which accepts no authority except the authority of its own reason.
>
> This is the road to moral, social and economic anarchism—the road to chaos and revolution. And this is the road we are traveling today. Yet our religious leaders, to say nothing of our intellectual and political leaders, with few exceptions, do not even know it.

One must infer from this that the religion Dr. Link has in mind is "unreasonable." Such a conception of religion reveals the joint effect of dogma and materialism on the race mind. Because science affords no religious ideal, it is believed that of necessity a religious ideal *must* be unscientific—irrational. We need only turn to the purer forms of Buddhism to find the explicit statement that any idea which is repugnant to the individual reason of the Buddhist forms no part of his doctrine. Yet Buddhism, among all the religions of the world, has alone been a lasting power for good among mankind.

An eminent authority on religious philosophy, Prof. Harry A. Wolfson of Harvard University, regards the vast stream of religious thought in the West as an unsuccessful attempt to synthesize philosophy and religion. (New York *Times*, June 6.) The medieval philosophers, he says, with the exception of Maimonides, did

violence to the philosophical concept of God, so that it could be truly said of them that they made philosophy the "handmaiden of theology." The crucial problem in this synthesis was the "Personality of God"—God's attributes: " . . . in which an attempt was made to reconcile the concept that God has personal humanlike attributes, such as love, goodness and mercy, with the concept of the Divine Being as immutable, indefinable, unrelated and incomparable to anything else in the universe created by Him."

To medieval thinkers, the Scripture was of revealed and divine origin—an authority not to be questioned. But both religion and science were vital truths, and "one therefore could not logically follow both unless one could reconcile them in thought."

> The method of reconciliation consisted in interpreting the language of the Scriptures in terms of philosophy.
>
> Nowadays this method is described as "rationalization" . . . It was not until Spinoza denied the divine origin of the Scripture that this rationalization had to be simultaneously discarded by philosophy.

Dr. Wolfson characterizes religious endeavors to synthesize science and religion as an attempt "to reconcile the irreconcilable." He writes realistically of modern religion:

> Nowadays, ever since Kant proved that the existence of God cannot be demonstrated by "pure reason," but that it must be assumed as a postulate of "practical reason," we are in the habit of justifying religion not as a revealed truth, but as a convenience. We are already acquainted with theologies which find a justification for the religious way of life without the assumption of a God of revelation. But as for that matter, there are those who similarly justify science as a convenience without subscribing to its creeds. For example, there are communities where they build hospitals with all the modern scientific equipment but at the same time prohibit the teaching of evolution.
>
> The average man of today, regardless of his beliefs or disbeliefs in science or religion, likes to enjoy the fruits of both of them, for in his unthinking moments science means nothing but to push a button to get illumination, and religion, similarly, means nothing but to offer a prayer to get divine illumination.

From this more or less faithful portrayal of our moral and intellectual poverty, we see how deeply modern life is permeated with an attitude which, were we to dignify it by a philosophical term, might be called Pragmatism. God is "needed" in this painful world: therefore we will believe in Him. As William James once

remarked: "I am perfectly willing to admit any number of noumenal beings or events into philosophy if only their pragmatic value can be shown." The famous American psychologist perhaps did not realize that with this mode of reasoning he provided a practical justification of the "God" whose aid is invoked by warring nations —a god whose judgment of the morality of national policy is written by Ministers of Propaganda in terms of political necessity. The absurdity of "God" as "a convenience" is well illustrated by a cartoon which appeared in the great German comic paper, *Simplicissimus,* in 1903, depicting a baby Hohenzollern prince explaining the heavens to his brothers and sisters. Pointing at the stars, he declared: "Those are the Orders of Honor that have been awarded to the dear God for his services to the House of Hohenzollern."

This is the sort of religion and deity that our religious leaders would have us embrace once again. A personal god *must* have attributes, and the only attributes that *we* know of are human. As pointed out by H. P. B.—

> The personal God of orthodox Theism perceives, thinks, and is affected by emotion; he repents and feels "fierce anger." But the notion of such mental states clearly involves the unthinkable postulate of the externality of the exciting stimuli, to say nothing of the impossibility of ascribing changelessness to a Being whose emotions fluctuate with events in the worlds he presides over. The conceptions of a Personal God as changeless and infinite are thus unpsychological and, what is worse, unphilosophical. *(The Secret Doctrine* I, 2 fn.)

From personal attributes to the reflection of human partiality and favoritism in the conception of deity is an inevitable sequence. This, our benevolent but wholly irrational religious philosophers fail to recognize. They are enthralled by the quality of *Sattva* in the ideal, blinded by *Tamas* of intellect to the terrible consequences of this blighting falsehood. Thus, the crusade of the modern theologian is a march back into the darkness of the Middle Ages.

Eugene William Lyman, professor of the philosophy of religion at the Union Theological Seminary, a widely influential writer, would have us accept a God who is the origin of all that is "good, beautiful and true," while holding that evil is alien to the nature of deity. In *The Meaning and Truth of Religion* (Scribner's, 1933), he says:

> To carry the explanation of evil back into something dark and recalcitrant in the nature of God we cannot but regard as erroneous and as impairing the full force of the moral and religious solutions . . . Limiting conditions there are for God's

> action, but they are such conditions as arise from the essential nature of reason [Dr. Lyman's reason?], from creativity in time, and from the purpose to achieve a community of finite creative spirits. There is no reason for limiting the divine transcendence in respect to those meanings of transcendence which are vital to ethical religion. For the fullest synthesis of experience and for the fullest justification of a dynamic faith we need the conception of God as transcending the world in that he is the world-ground, in that he is a spiritual personality whose nature is wholly characterized by Truth, Beauty and Goodness, and in that the power which belongs to his Creative Reason and Love is inexhaustible. (p. 435-6.)

Dr. Lyman presents the illuminating spectacle of a theologian in the act of creating "God." Our "needs" are thus and so, and he fashions a deity that he thinks will serve their satisfaction. Such learned childishness moved Robert Ingersoll to observe, "An honest God is the noblest work of man."

If it be conceded that the nature and will of deity can be interpreted by human thought, then every claim of authority by every priest in every age has equal validity. The use made of that authority varies with the individual morality and intelligence of the priest, the quality of which is disclosed by the history of priestcraft in the western world—recorded in blood and tears.

The Rev. Dr. John A. Mackay, who in February of this year became president of the Princeton Theological Seminary, describes the attitude toward religion held by some earnest political reformers in South America. (New York *Times*, Feb. 21.) They call it "a collection of scruples that impede the free exercise of thought," bitterly declaring, "God has evidently kept religion for himself and handed over politics to men." A young Peruvian said:

> You don't know what it takes out of me to say "God." That name is associated in my mind with peoples and attitudes and institutions that I feel I must give my life to combat.

Dr. Mackay is aghast at "the chaos into which materialism has plunged the human race." He accuses religion, democracy and education of having failed in their responsibility to humanity. The time has come, he says, for these institutions to be mercilessly self-critical. "Penitence and humility will mark the first step on the new road." While deeply concerned with the social impotence of religion, he is not even conscious of its real cause. *This is the religious creeds themselves.* Condemning the easy religious liberalism of the scientific age, he demands a reaffirmation of the theological

dogmas—"the sovereignty of God" and "the authority of the scriptures." In this, the *Times* writer comments, he is joined by a large and growing school of leaders in his own and other evangelical churches. Here is Dr. Mackay's solution:

> The young today demand a master, a cause, something to live by. Materialism cannot stifle the altruism in the human soul, the yearning of youth to be identified with something greater than life itself, to which it can give itself utterly. Religion, if it will go about its work in the spirit of the prophets and the apostles of old, can satisfy that demand. And it is the only thing in life that can.

In 1884 a *Mahatma* wrote, "This is the moment to guide the recurrent impulse which must soon come and which will push the age towards extreme atheism or drag it back to extreme sacerdotalism, if it is not led to the primitive soul-satisfying philosophy of the Aryans." When those who, like Dr. Mackay, sit in high places, urge a return to a God outside of ourselves, we may be sure that "recurrent impulse" is upon us. Never was there greater need for true knowledge of the first fundamental proposition of the Secret Doctrine. The "God" of religion is the arch-enemy of the true religious spirit, blinding mankind to the Divinity within. Said H.P.B.:

> It is to avoid such anthropomorphic conceptions that the Initiates never use the epithet "God" to designate the One and Secondless Principle in the Universe; and that—faithful in this to the oldest traditions of the Secret Doctrine the world over—they deny that such imperfect and often not very clean work could ever be produced by Absolute Perfection. There is no need to mention here other still greater metaphysical difficulties. Between speculative Atheism and idiotic anthropomorphism there must be a philosophical mean, and a reconciliation. The Presence of the Unseen Principle throughout all nature, and the highest manifestation of it on Earth—MAN— can alone help to solve the Problem, which is that of the mathematician whose *x* must ever elude the grasp of our terrestrial algebra. (*S.D.* II, 555.)

Thus, Man-spirit proves God-spirit. This is the key to the age-old conflict between Science and Religion, hidden beneath the sacramental phrases left by every Great Teacher. "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me," said Jesus. "The spiritually wise," taught Krishna, "is verily myself, because with heart at peace he is upon the road that leadeth to the highest path, which is even myself." Did they mean them-

selves as *persons*? The "I" known to Jesus is the I which is one with the Father in Heaven; the "I" of Krishna the same as "the Ego which is seated in the hearts of all beings—the beginning, the middle, and the end of all existing things." This is the God in Man, the only God there is—"The living power made free in him, that power which is HIMSELF."

Such is the teaching of Theosophy, the philosophy of human perfectibility. Embracing both the scientific and the religious, it is a scientific religion and a religious science.

Looking to the future, students sometimes wonder if the churches will someday be brought to support the view of Theosophy. The answer to this question, as well as a statement of the work we have on hand, is found in an article by William Q. Judge—"The Future and the Theosophical Society":

> . . . we can never hope to see the churches and the ministers coming over in a body to our ranks. It would be asking too much of human nature. Churches are so much property that has to be preserved, and ministers are so many men who get salaries they have to earn, with families to support and reputations to sustain. Many "houses of worship" are intimately connected with the material progress of the town, and the personal element would prevent their sinking the old and glorious identity in an organization like to ours. Congregations hire their priests at so much a year to give out a definite sort of theology, and do not like to be told the truth about themselves nor to have too high a standard of altruism held up to them in a way from which, under the theosophical doctrines, there would be no escape. They may all gradually change, heresy trials will continue and heretical ministers will be acquitted, but the old buildings will remain and the speakers go on in new grooves to make other reputations, but we may not hope to see any universal rush to join us.
>
> Our destiny is to continue the wide work of the past in affecting literature and thought throughout the world, while our ranks see many changing quantities but always holding those who remain true to the program and refuse to become dogmatic or to give up common sense in theosophy. Thus will we wait for the new messenger, striving to keep the organization alive that he may use it and have the great opportunity H.P.B. outlines when she says, "Think how much one to whom such an opportunity is given could accomplish."

GREAT THEOSOPHISTS

The Kabala and the Kabalists

THE Theosophists of the Middle Ages drew their occult knowledge from two streams of thought which, long before, had sprung from a common source. One of these streams was the Hermetic philosophy, the other was the Kabala. In our modern dictionaries the Kabala is defined as "the mystic Theosophy of the Hebrews." The prominent Kabalistic writer, Dr. Christian D. Ginsburg, speaks of it as a system of religious philosophy, or *Theosophy*, which not only exercised a powerful influence upon the Jews for hundreds of years, but also captivated the minds of some of the greatest thinkers of Christendom.

What is known today as the Kabala is a highly complex system having four distinct divisions. The first, or *practical* Kabala, deals principally with ceremonial magic. The second division, or the *literal* Kabala, is subdivided into three sections: (1) the *Gematria,* which discusses the numerical value of Hebrew words; (2) the *Notaricon*, which treats of the formation of words; and (3) the *Temura*, which deals with the relationship between words. The third division is the unwritten, or *secret* Kabala, which is always transmitted orally. The fourth is the *dogmatic* Kabala, which consists of four sections: (1) the *Sepher Jetzirah*, or Book of Formation; (2) the *Sepher Sephiroth*, which unfolds the Doctrine of Emanations; (3) the *Asch Metzareph*, which treats of the science of Alchemy; and (4) the *Zohar*, or Book of Splendor. The *Zohar* itself has five sections: (1) the *Sepher Dzeniouta*, or Book of the Concealed Mysteries; (2) the *Idra Rabba*, or Greater Holy Assembly; (3) the *Idra Suta*, or Lesser Holy Assembly; (4) the *Beth-Elohim*, or House of the Gods; and (5) the Book of the Revolutions of Souls.

The *traditional* origin of the Kabala closely resembles the opening sentences of the fourth discourse of *The Bhagavad-Gita*. According to the account, the Kabala is divine Wisdom which was first taught by God to a company of angels. Adam caught glimpses of these truths and passed his vision on to Noah. Noah communicated it unto Abraham, who in turn taught it to the Egyptians. Moses gained his knowledge in Egypt and passed it on to his seventy elders. From them the Kabala was transmitted orally until the year A. D. 80, when some of the teachings were committed to

writing. At this point tradition stops and actual history begins. And from that history we can complete Krishna's sentence and say: "In the course of time the mighty art was lost."

The *actual* origin of the Kabala is somewhat different. At the beginning of our Fifth Race, about one million years ago, the knowledge which had been accumulated by thousands of generations of initiated Adepts was recorded in written form. The language used was *Senzar*, the secret sacerdotal tongue which preceded Sanscrit and was known to the Initiates from time immemorial. Among the scriptures drawn from this primeval source were the Chaldean *Book of Numbers*, the *Sepher Dzeniouta* and the *Sepher Jetzirah*. These books form the basis of the written Kabala. The *unwritten*, secret, or orally transmitted Kabala belonged to the *Chaldees* or *Magi*, those great Aryan Adepts who came to Babylonia thousands of years before the Jews settled in that country, and who, according to a statement made by one of the Theosophical Mahatmas, "were at the apex of their occult fame before what you term the Bronze Age." Abraham gained his knowledge of the Kabala from the Chaldees while he was living in the city of Ur. Moses acquired his in Egypt when he was a priest of the Sun, living in the city of Heliopolis.

The first person to be initiated by Moses was his elder brother Aaron, whose name heads the list of initiated *Nabaiim*, or Prophets. From that time on, Schools of the Prophets began to appear in the countries inhabited by the Jews. In these schools every branch of science was taught, the study of Alchemy forming an important part of the curriculum. They were also Schools of the Mysteries, where the probationers were subjected to the same rigorous form of discipline as the Eastern *Chela*. Those who had passed through their final initiation were known as the Innocents, the Infants, or the "Little Ones."

The first Jews to call themselves Kabalists were the *Tanaiim*, who lived in Jerusalem about the beginning of the third century B. C. Two centuries later three important Jewish Kabalists appeared. The first was Jehoshuah ben Pandira, now known as Jesus the Christ. The second was the great Chaldean teacher Hillel. The third was Philo Judaeus, in whose writings we find a clear statement of the three fundamental propositions of Theosophy. He defined God as an "Idea free of all mixture, devoid of all combination, which pervades everything and fills the entire Universe." Within that unlimited and unnameable Principle, he said, "is an eternal and immutable Law which is the strong and lasting support

of the Universe." In regard to man, Philo wrote that "Man is the noblest of all creatures by reason of the higher element, the Soul, which is pure in its essence, the faithful image and copy of the Eternal Idea." (*De. Decal.* XXV.)

During the siege of Jerusalem in the year 80 A. D., an Adept-Rabbi, Simon ben Jochai by name, escaped from the city and hid himself in a cave, where he remained for twelve years. After his death two of his disciples, Rabbi Eliezar and Rabbi Abba, collected some of the manuscripts he had left and compiled them into a book. This was the original *Zohar*.

For the next thousand years the Kabala was studied in secrecy and silence. But in the eleventh century Rabbi Ibn Gebirol (also known as Avicebron) produced two important Kabalistic works: the *Fons Vitae*, and the *Kether Malchuth*, the latter being a superb poem indicating the impersonality of the First Great Principle:

> Thou art ONE, and Thy Unity is never diminished, never extended, and cannot be changed. Thou art ONE, and no thought of mine can fix for Thee a limit, or define Thee. Thou ART, but not as one existent, for the understanding and vision of mortals cannot attain to Thy existence, nor determine for Thee the where, the why and the how.

In the twelfth century the Theosophical Doctrine of Emanations was introduced by Rabbi Isaac the Blind and his pupil Rabbi Azariel ben Menachem, and in the thirteenth century a second *Zohar* appeared, this one compiled by the Spanish Rabbi Moses de Leon. After the appearance of this *Zohar*, the Kabalistic teachings were taken up by the Christians, the first Christian to call himself a Kabalist being Raymond Lully. Since that time virtually everyone connected with the work of the Theosophical Movement seems to have been a student of Hebrew philosophy. As men like Sir Isaac Newton, Spinoza and Leibnitz drew attention to the Kabala, the number of its students steadily increased, and when H. P. B. came on the scene there were hundreds of kabalistic students scattered about in Europe and America, many of whom became members of the Theosophical Society.

The present-day Kabala contains many Theosophical teachings. The *Sepher Dzeniouta* opens with the words: "The Book of the Concealed Mysteries is the Book of the Equilibrium of Balance." This refers to the Point in the Circle, which "hangeth in that region which is negatively existent." That region is described as *Ain-Soph*, the "Boundless" or "Limitless." Within *Ain-Soph* the Primordial

Point, *Sephira*, appears. Sephira, by dividing itself into two parts, emits *Chochmah*, the male potency, and *Binah*, the female potency.

> The first three Sephiroth are purely intellectual in metaphysics. They express the absolute identity of existence and thought, and form what the modern Kabalists call the intelligible world.—(Franck: *Die Kabbala.*)

From this primordial Trinity seven emanations issue, each emanation differing in its degree of perfection in proportion to its distance from the Supreme Power. According to the Kabala, matter is merely the most remote effect of this emanative energy.

The story of the successive attempts to form universes, which is fully discussed in *The Secret Doctrine*, appears also in the *Zohar*:

> There were old worlds which perished as soon as they came into existence, were formless and were called sparks. The sparks are the primordial worlds which could not continue, because the Sacred Aged had not yet assumed its form of King and Queen (which occurred in the Third Race) and the Master (the reincarnating Ego) was not yet at work.—(*Idra Suta.*)

Many Kabalists have taught the Theosophical tenet that man was hermaphrodite in the early part of the Third Race. Some of them say that man was created with a male and a female body which were joined together at the shoulders. Others say that the separation of the sexes occurred during the "sleep of Adam." The Kabalists also say that man is a seven-fold being, and in Myer's *Kabala* a definite Hebrew name is given to each of the seven principles, corresponding perfectly with the Sanscrit names used in Theosophical literature. The doctrine of Reincarnation is also a Kabalistic teaching. In the second book of the Zohar the soul pleads for freedom from rebirth, saying that she does not wish to be returned to earth where she will again be subjected to all sorts of pollutions. But the soul is informed that she will be reborn even against her will.

In the third book of the Zohar the fate of the soul who has broken her connection with her Higher Self is graphically described: "All souls which have alienated themselves from the Holy One have thrown themselves into an abyss, and have anticipated the time when they are to descend once more upon the earth."—(*Idra Suta.*)

The cycle of rebirths which every soul, under the law of Karma, must experience, is described in the Kabala under the term *Gilgoolem*. Philo Judaeus shows that the doctrine of Reincarnation was

accepted by the Kabalistic Jews in the first century B. C.: "The air is full of souls; those who are nearest to earth descending to be tied to mortal bodies return to other bodies, desiring to live in them."—(*De Somniis.*)

It is quite apparent that the written Kabala of the present day contains numerous Theosophical teachings. But an important question arises: Is the *real* Kabala contained in the books now known by that name?

The word *Kabala* comes from the root Q B L, which means "to receive." This suggests that the true Kabala is no mere book or collection of books, but rather a *system* which has been passed down orally from one generation of Initiates to the next. According to the teachings of Theosophy, the Kabala is not merely one system, but consists of *seven* systems which may be applied in seven different ways, providing seven interpretations to any given esoteric subject. The real Kabala, therefore, is not available to the public. The book which contains the fullest record of these seven systems is the *Oriental Kabala.* There is only one copy of this book in existence, and that is in the hands of those Initiates who, at the present day, are the only genuine Kabalists, and out of whose possession it is not likely to come.

Students of Theosophy know that no Great Teacher has left his esoteric instructions in books which are available to the public. The Hebrew Initiates were bound by the same pledge of secrecy as all other Initiates. As Simon ben Jochai was an *Adept*-Rabbi, and therefore bound by the Sodalian Oath not to reveal the Mysteries to the world at large, it is quite apparent that even the *original* Zohar could not have divulged those Mysteries, whatever else it may have revealed. As for the second Zohar of Moses de Leon, it is known that he was helped in his compilation by a number of Syrian and Chaldean Christian Gnostics, and that it passed through many other Christian hands in the course of time. This *second* Zohar is only a little less exoteric than the Old Testament itself.

Is there really any *printed* book which contains the real Kabala? The Oriental Kabala, the only book which contains a complete record of the seven systems, is in the hands of Eastern Initiates, and therefore not available to the public. Nor is the Chaldean *Book of Numbers*, which forms the hidden basis of the written Kabala, now procurable. Only two or three copies of this book are extant, and they are in the hands of private individuals. A Chinese Kabala, called the *Yih-King*, is said to have been written in 2850

B. C. in the dialect of the Akkadians, those early Aryan immigrants who first civilized Babylonia and made it a center of Sanscrit learning. Who at the present time has access to this work? An important Vatican manuscript of the Kabala is said to have been possessed by the Count de St. Germain. Where is it today?

Many students are eager to learn the esoteric meaning of Hebrew philosophy. But although one may read all the books of the Kabala in the original, and then the numberless commentaries, in the end he can only find himself utterly confused by the many different translations of the texts, by the veils deliberately thrown over the archaic doctrines and by the ignorance of profane writers. Many clues to the Hebrew Mysteries will be found in the writings of the medieval Kabalists, but they can yield little accurate information unless the student possesses the key.

Where can this key be found?

H. P. B. once made an interesting statement which should give pause to all would-be students of the Kabala. She said that *she was the only Kabalist in America.* Perhaps the student will find what he is seeking if he turns to her voluminous writings for information. If he perseveres in his search, learning to read between the lines and within the words, he will find *three* keys to the Mysteries. As for the rest—

> The last four keys of the seven that throw wide open the portals to the mysteries of Nature are in the hands of the highest Initiates, and cannot be divulged to the masses at large—not in this, our century, at least.—(*The Secret Doctrine*, II, 517.)

An Impartial Philosophy

Theosophy allows a hearing and a fair chance to all. It deems no views—if sincere—entirely destitute of truth. It respects thinking men, to whatever class of thought they may belong. Ever ready to oppose ideas and views which can only create confusion without benefiting philosophy, it leaves their expounders personally to believe in whatever they please, and does justice to their ideas when they are good. Indeed, the conclusions or deductions of a philosophic writer may be entirely opposed to our views and the teachings we expound; yet, his premises and statements of facts may be quite correct, and other people may profit by the adverse philosophy, even if we ourselves reject it, believing we have something higher and still nearer to the truth.—H. P. Blavatsky.

WHY AM I A THEOSOPHIST?

THEOSOPHISTS even more than other men have need to define to themselves their own relation to the philosophy they have accepted—this for very far-reaching reasons. Those reasons may be in part suggested, but if, as is all too often the case, they are considered on the ordinary terms, then their value is lost in the intended sense. Let us, then, in the first instance consider the question: Why Am I a Theosophist?

No doubt each Theosophist, if asked the question by an "outsider," would be at no loss to reply, but would his answer be accurate—or *ex post facto?* Everyone can give a reason or reasons for "the faith that is in him," but, when examined, it will usually be plain that these supposed reasons have been developed since the given faith was adopted. But why was *it,* and not some other, adopted in the beginning, when we had no particular faith of our own or had "lost our faith" in something else?

Did we select and choose Theosophy as a Judge or Jury reaches a decision or renders a verdict—presumably after close consideration of the Law and the facts? Hardly. We *accepted* Theosophy, rather than chose it: one might say, in some cases at least, that Theosophy selected us, rather than we it.

The question, then, is not so simple as might appear at first glance. What we do know, by experience and by observation, is that most men accept or reject what is before them simply on the basis, "that suits me," or, "I don't like that." In other words, if what is tendered is in accordance with our mind as now constituted, we accept it, otherwise we reject it—in either case with no serious "argumentation" or "deliberation," using these two words in Patanjali's psychological sense. No matter what we accept or what we reject, if this is our basis of determination, we are simply governed in our choice by the principle of Desire—*Kama-Manas,* as it is called in Theosophy. This means that our Reason is dominated by the Animal principle in us, that *Antaskarana* is a closed gate to the entrance of any Truth or truths that may be unpalatable or painful. This "state of mind" is otherwise called "human nature," the "personality," and by similar carefully clothed designations. In this condition Antaskarana, instead of being a two-way bridge between the Higher and the Lower Self, "the path that lies between thy Spirit and thy self," becomes in sober fact "the highway of sensations, the rude arous-

ers of *Ahankara*"—which *The Voice of the Silence* designates as "the 'I' or feeling of one's personality, the 'I-am-ness'." In the same fashion, *Light on the Path* advises all Disciples: "Before the eyes can see they must be incapable of tears. Before the ear can hear it must have lost its sensitiveness."

Is a Theosophist less sensitive than other men to what wounds his self-esteem, his "personality"? Rather it is probable the testimony would be unanimous that Theosophists are of all people the ones who find it hardest to "dwell together in unison"—in the home, in business, at the "Lodge," and in all those matters which invite or impel to "dissensions and differences of individual opinion." And yet, we all affirm, "There is no Religion higher than Truth."

Have Theosophists reflected that if their philosophy is what they claim for it, the Truth, the *living* truth, it must of necessity act as an all-powerful catalytic agent, precipitating whatever is untrue and erroneous in our nature—from latency to light. And this *hurts*—every Theosophist knows this by direct experience, let alone his observation of his fellows. What, then, is one to do? Have charity, the "key of *Dana*" ready to hand—charity for the other man who so misunderstands us, charity for "us," who so misunderstand ourselves.

But why are Theosophists so "sensitive" instead of *sensible* as we all aim to be? It is because, amongst other "reasons," we find it easier and more agreeable to apply our philosophy to others. But, deeper than that, is an Occult reason indeed—one well worth dwelling upon, from both directions of Antaskarana. This reason is that no one can sincerely call upon the Higher Self for help, for guidance, for illumination, and fail of a response—this wholly regardless of his personal status, good, bad, or indifferent. Once we have made this appeal to the Divine in us, we *cannot* go on thinking, feeling, acting, speaking, as we did before. We have ourselves invited the *Mahabharata,* the "Holy War": the "flying of *arrows* has begun"—from *both* sides of our nature.

Then we find, if we take the position of Arjuna-Krishna, *between* the contending forces, that we must choose: we cannot remain neutral, we cannot compromise, we cannot evade, nor can we avoid the costs of combat. Putting the situation another way: *Manas,* the true individual Ego or Self, is now in the position of Perceiver, a position in which he sees that the Theosophical life is "without quarter" from either side, above or below. Something is now both awake and active in him which before was

merely the "Silent Spectator." All that is best in the man appeals to the Higher Self, all that is lowest or less than the Man (Manas) cries out against the ordeal. And it is Manas that *must* choose, must *decide.*

This is really the first step in Discipleship. The *Mahabharata* is in eighteen books or divisions, the War lasts eighteen "Days," *with no fighting at night,* and the *Bhagavad-Gita* is in eighteen chapters or sections of Discourse, *i. e.,* "argumentation" between Arjuna (Manas, the reincarnating Ego) and Krishna (*Atma-Buddhi,* the Higher Self). Is there no significance in this number eighteen and its several correspondences?

The "pleasure and pain" Theosophist has a "hard time" of it indeed—and it will continue growing harder all the time, perhaps for many life-times, until by sufferance, by endurance, by study and by "works" he turns to self-introspection to find out what is the "matter" with *him,* not to avoid the struggle, but to learn how to fight that hardest and stoutest foeman of all—"himself," as he has hitherto esteemed himself to be. Curious expression that, in the *Gita*: "this glorious *unsought fight!*

When we "accepted" Theosophy we weren't seeking a fight! Least of all were we seeking a fight with ourselves! Yet a fight is precisely what happens, a fight with ourself exactly what is precipitated. It is easy to change relations, religions, philosophies, and other occupations of the mind. It is not easy to change ourself, *i. e.,* our deeply engraved and ingrained notions of who and what we are, what is due us, and so on through the whole category of human nature.

What we *had* been seeking was "peace and plenty" for our own mind, nature, circumstances. 'Tis "a rude awakening" indeed, but when we turn to "deliberation" we shall see that this "crash of onset" is something more than "our Karma" or the sins of others. It is the answer of the Higher Self to our petition. And in that reflection, our "sensitiveness" becomes an Occult Power. We become so sensitive to others' needs and woes that we can *feel* the wise thing to say or do, to refrain from doing or saying. Our "sensitiveness" becomes *responsiveness—Shila.*

When this is felt, seen, heard, *realized,* then "the four senses blend and ready are to pass into the fifth, that of the *inner touch.*

What may be this "inner touch"? Perhaps it is sympathy, forgiveness, charity, love, "consideration for others" in every sense—first-hand consideration. Perhaps it is akin to that "Divine Com-

passion" of which we have been reading in the *Voice* with some inner answering yearning to become and be like that.

In this connection there is a quotation, and with it a foot-note, in *The Secret Doctrine,* II, 59, to which Theosophists interested in "knowing why" are referred. One might comment additionally that the kind of "inside information" thus hinted at is not only the "inner touch" with the nature and case of another, enabling us to be "a very present help in time of need"—*his* need—but even more is it true of ourselves, for it puts the man in union, if but for an instant, with the Higher Self. Not only does "the higher see through the eyes of the lower" in that supernal "ultimate moment," but the lower sees through the eyes of the Higher: Manas enters into union with Atma-Buddhi.

Then, of a truth, the man knows why he is a Theosophist. But he cannot tell another, cannot impart the great Secret. He can tell others that it is the one thing worth knowing, for in that knowledge, he has tasted the *Soma*-juice of *Kshanti* of which even the veritable Voice of the Silence can only speak:

> "Have patience, Candidate, as one who fears no failure, courts no success. Fix thy Soul's gaze upon the star whose ray thou art, the flaming star that shines within the lightless depths of ever-being, the boundless fields of the Unknown."

Eternal Verities

Good literature proceeds from men of natural probity, and since one ought rather to praise the inception than the result, you should give greater praise to a man of probity unskilled in letters than to one skilled in letters but devoid of probity.—Leonardo Da Vinci.

The Western mind is apt to look upon mere literary form and fine phrases as the standard of judgment. People in general do not get the *meaning* of what is written, in the same way that they do not extract the value from their experiences. They make surface deductions and applications only. So they have little ability to apply the philosophy to daily life, nor can they see its practical value. They have to be helped to assimilate the fundamental principles if they are to realize right valuations and applications.—Robert Crosbie.

SCIENCE AND THE SECRET DOCTRINE

> In order to avoid creating new misconceptions, let it be stated that among the three *secret* orbs (or star-angels) neither Uranus nor Neptune entered; not only because they were unknown under these names to the ancient Sages, but because they, as all other planets, however many there may be, are the *gods* and guardians of other septenary chains of globes within our systems.
>
> Nor do the two last discovered great planets depend entirely on the Sun like the rest of the planets. Otherwise, how explain the fact that Neptune receives 900 times less light than our Earth, and Uranus 390 times less, and that their satellites show a peculiarity of inverse rotation found in no other planets of the Solar System. At any rate, what we say applies to Uranus, though recently the fact begins again to be disputed.
>
> This subject will, of course, be considered mere vagary by all those who confuse the universal order of being with their own systems of classification. Here, however, simple facts from Occult teachings are stated, to be either accepted or rejected, as the case may be. There are details which, on account of their great metaphysical abstractions, *cannot* be entered upon. Hence, we merely state that only seven of our planets are as intimately related to our globe, as the Sun is to all the bodies subject to him in his system. Of these bodies the poor little number of *primary* and *secondary* planets known to astronomy, looks wretched enough, in truth. Therefore, it stands to reason that there are a great number of planets, small and large, that have not been discovered yet, but of the existence of which ancient astronomers—all of them initiated adepts—must have certainly been aware. But, as their relation to the gods was sacred, it had to remain arcane, as also the names of various other planets and stars. (*The Secret Doctrine*, 1888, I, 575.)

IT is clear to all studious theosophists that Neptune, Uranus, and doubtless the recently discovered Pluto, do not belong to the occult Solar System, not only from such passages as the above, but from many significant omissions of description as to their constitution and function. The interrelations between the sun and planets, and between planets, are necessarily under fixed law, no more haphazard than the valences binding together the atoms of a molecule.

There is, then, the problem of the true relationship between the outer three planets (so far discovered) and the planetary system as such; and the question of whether there is physical evidence of peculiarities in the status of these planets.

All scientific theories of the constitution of the solar system involve certain primary ideas, namely—

1. The rotation of the sun;
2. The revolution of all the planets about the sun in the same direction as the earth's rotation;
3. Rotation of the planets in the same direction as the earth;
4. Revolution of the satellites about their planets in the same direction (with few exceptions) that the planets rotate on their axes;
5. That the orbital planes of the planets are nearly coincident with the plane of the solar equator.

The above is a symmetrical and satisfying description of a perfect mechanical system. *But*—it is a description of the solar system as it ought to be (to fit the prevailing theories) rather than of actual fact. This "ideal" is violated by one of the "planets" in the following ways:

1. The rotation of Uranus is retrograde, contrary to the rest of the known rotations.
2. The rotation of Uranus' four moons is also retrograde.
3. The orbits of Uranus' moons are at a sharp angle (82 degrees) with the orbital plane of the planets.
4. The plane of Uranus' equator is also 82 degrees and coincides with the plane of its moons.

Mechanically, therefore, Uranus and its moons present the perfect picture of a little solar system whose motions are all in the opposite direction from ours.

The case of Neptune is equally strange. It has one satellite with retrograde rotation; its own rotation has rather recently been determined, approximately, as between twelve and eighteen hours, with an equatorial inclination of 29 degrees. The satellite is inclined 37 degrees. We are informed that the direction of rotation of the planet has not been established. The retrograde motion of the satellite, however, and the sharp inclination of both, suggest conditions like those in the case of Uranus. It may be considered logical to suppose that a foreign element is involved (and with this most astronomers will agree) when any of the following elements are present:

1. Any retrograde motion.
2. Any undue inclination of a primary to the ecliptic.
3. Any large disco-ordination between the inclinations of primary and satellite.
4. Any marked divergence from Bode's Law.

The last condition is not on so secure a footing as the others because no physical reason for Bode's Law has ever been discovered. Its observed application, however, is too regular to be accounted for by "accident" or "coincidence." The following is a comparison of the positions of the planets as ascertained by observation, with their positions as estimated by Bode's Law:

PLANET	POSITION BY BODE'S LAW	ACTUAL POSITION
Vulcan	....	*(Existence doubted)*
Mercury	0.4	0.387
Venus	0.7	0.723
Earth	1.0	1.000
Mars	1.6	1.524
Asteroids (average)	2.8	2.75
Jupiter	5.2	5.203
Saturn	10.0	9.539
Uranus	19.6	19.191
Neptune	38.8	30.071
Pluto	77.2	41.25

Thus the Law breaks down badly with Neptune and completely with Pluto. On the other hand, Uranus, which otherwise looks most like a foundling in the Solar System, conforms quite closely to the Law.

Neptune presents a very strange peculiarity. It has a variation in brightness of about an eight-hour period. A former supposition, now exploded, was that this might be due to the fact that one side is darker than the other, an equivalent period of rotation causing the appearance. But if it is assumed that a periodic phenomenon of similar nature on two suns is inversely proportional in its time to the radius and density of the respective suns (a reasonable assumption under the laws of physics) and the bright period of Neptune equated to the eleven-year solar cycle of the sun, we find the ratio to be about 14,000 to 19,600—a sufficient likeness of quantity to indicate similar phenomena. If this is the case, *Neptune may be a tiny sun in partial Pralaya.* There is another point in favor of this and indicating the same for Uranus as well: the albedo or reflecting power of Saturn is the highest in the system proper; it is equalled by Uranus, and surpassed by Neptune, with 0.73. White paper is about 0.70. If Neptune and Uranus should themselves shed some light of solar quality, this would be consistent. Moreover, neither Neptune nor Uranus have any known surface marking.

Let us then tabulate the evidence indicating that these bodies may both be small suns in obscuration:

	Uranus	Neptune
Direction of rotation	Yes	(*Unknown*)
Inclination with ecliptic	Yes	Yes
Bode's Law	No	Yes
Light variation	No	Yes
Albedo	Yes	Yes
Symmetry of system	Yes	No

The last item refers to the fact noted above, that Uranus has a large number of moons rotating with it and in the plane of its equator. On the other hand, it is possible that more Neptunian moons may be discovered, which would alter the case. We may hope for more facts when the great Mount Palomar telescope is put in service; including, perhaps, some undiscovered planets. The conformity of Uranus to Bode's Law is not positive evidence against its being a sun, and the lack of variation in brightness of this body may be due to a deep pralayic condition. Note that its brightness is less than that of Neptune.

Granting that suns can exist as small as these bodies—Dr. G. P. Kuiper of Mount Wilson Observatory reports one only 4000 miles in diameter[1]—and that a wandering system can easily be captured, the evidence here assembled becomes extremely suggestive.

Theosophists are not (or are assumed not to be) sectarians, and so must feel, as did H. P. Blavatsky, a keen interest in modern research and hypothesis in every field of human inquiry. For special as well as for common reasons they follow sympathetically the efforts of astronomers. Astronomy was once one of the "Sacred Sciences" of the Mystery Schools of remote antiquity. Egyptian, Babylonian, and above all, ancient Hindu astronomers, have left still extant remains and records, confirmed in many particulars by modern research. In other respects these old observations deal with cycles so enormous as to be beyond credence by our learned observers, and so are rejected *a priori.*

An extremely provocative question may be raised: Lacking all modern instruments, means of exchanging information, and other facilities our civilization provides for such research, *How did these ancients secure the exact knowledge we have so far verified?*

They must have enjoyed means and methods unknown to us. And another profitable "observation" may be suggested for consideration! Perhaps modern astronomy may stand in relation to

[1]United Press, January 8, 1936.

the ancient Science about as modern "astrology" does to the mathematical actuarial calculations of these same ancients. Maybe the "Horoscopes" of these Ancients included "observations" as coldly and scientifically compiled as the Report of a Certified Public Accountant.

Another "observation" to be borne in mind is this: Being concerned with the Mysteries, ancient records of *all* kinds, not only their Scriptures, being for profane eyes and ears, contain only what the Initiates chose in their Wisdom to reveal, whether for the use of the era in which they lived, or as muniments for later followers, esoteric as well as exoteric—so that the chain of continuity might be recoverable.

H. P. Blavatsky called attention to the past for the sake of the present and future generations. In doing so, she calculatedly strewed her writings with "hints" for the intuitive-minded. Along with the quotation taken as a text, then, the reader may be reminded that of the seven planets supposedly belonging to our solar system, three are under other laws than any known to modern astronomy. The same as to certain comets, and as to the meteoric swarm. They are "*in* our solar system but not *of* it," say the Occult teachings.

Finally, there may be something worth thinking over in this single phrase of H. P. B.'s, tucked away in a forgotten article:

> The sun, which is the centre of our system, *is the centre of other systems too*, . . .

NEWTON—A PYTHAGOREAN

Sir Isaac Newton held to the Pythagorean corpuscular theory, and was also inclined to admit its consequences; which made the Count de Maistre hope, at one time, that Newton would ultimately lead Science back to the recognition of the fact that *Forces* and the Celestial bodies *were propelled and guided by Intelligences* (Soirees, vol. ii.). But de Maistre counted without his host. The innermost thoughts and ideas of Newton were perverted, and of his great mathematical learning, only the mere physical husk was turned to account. Had poor Sir Isaac foreseen to what use his successors and followers would apply his "gravity," that pious and religious man would surely have quietly eaten his apple, and never breathed a word about any mechanical ideas connected with its fall.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

FATE AND FREE-WILL

NO more hackneyed subject of controversy exists than that involved in this "pair of opposites." It has been argued pro and con for ages by the learned as well as the untutored. It underlies the scholasticism of theology and materialism alike, between which religions there is no more logical difference than between tweedledee and tweedledum. "Logical difference" is the right distinction, because the one has as much reason on his side as the other. The "difference" lies, not in their logic but in their premises, and neither has reason enough on his own side to see that the severer the logic, the farther asunder the conclusions reached. Without premises, no use of the intellectual principle. With premises, logic makes the conclusion irresistible.

That each is free to choose his own premises, make his own assumptions, is indubitable. Premises once chosen, assumptions once made, this exercise of free-will arouses the reason. This is inevitable—fate. If the premises are faulty, incomplete, the conclusion is the more false the truer the logical action of the reason. Being false, the individual struggles against his "fate" or succumbs to it. This is free-will. Materialists are constantly changing their conclusions. So are the theologians. All the time the principles and powers invoked remain a constant quantity and quality, only our use of them varying with every instant. No man can by any possibility abstain from exercising his free-will at every passing moment, for at each instant he is confronted with the necessity for choice.

"Necessity" is only another word for "fate." The power of choice is only another phrase for "free-will." The two can no more be separated than can cause and effect. Without cause, no effect. Without effects no cause can exist. What is the explanation? The three fundamental assumptions or propositions of Theosophy, the secret doctrine of man and of nature.

Our past is "fate," because already chosen and made. Our present is the domain of free-will. As it is exercised "*in* reason," so will the future be determined. Will without reason becomes desire. Reason without will becomes "fate," the creature, not the creator. What deforms the intellectual principle? Preconception, one-sidedness, bias, partisanship—*selfishness*.

PHILOSOPHIES OF GOVERNMENT

PROBLEMS of government and of the social order, like those which are eternally present in the life of the individual, must have their true solution in Theosophical philosophy, but in this field of human affairs the difficulties of application are somewhat different in nature. In personal life, the great task of the student is to assume and maintain an impartial attitude toward his own defects and virtues, to search out and examine his motives in the white light of impersonality—of the Higher Self.

An objective view of world conditions, however, presents far fewer obstacles for the reason that in most cases the student plays the role of spectator rather than that of one actively engaged in statecraft and politics. But here the multiplicity of factors, the infinite shadings of motive and the ramifying complexity of each situation and relation bring other checks to clear perception of the working of moral law and the path of right action. Nevertheless, if theosophists are to fulfill their mission— that of "changing the Buddhi-Manas of the Race"—they must endeavor to understand the principles involved, so that their own wider attitude may in turn reflect light to others. While as students "we do not meddle in politics," it is the duty of every worker to regard each event in terms of the law of Karma and the doctrine of Cycles—a service far more "practical" than the so-called "direct action," which is always bounded by the limitations of the Race Mind. The work of the students of this cycle, as a careful study of the lines laid down will show, is primarily on the plane of Ideas.

What, then, are the major problems of modern political thought?

To deal justly with such a question is something of a problem in itself, for while the principles of Theosophy should provide a much more synthetic view of the subject than is possible to other observers, still, the mistake of "over-simplifiation" reduces the wealth of explanation given by H.P.B. to a mere repetition of what was well known before her advent. Great reformers of every age have taught that "Selfishness" is the cause of all evil, political and otherwise, and that "Greed" is the spring of all conflict. The contribution of modern Theosophy is the *scientific basis* for Ethics. This must be presented to the inquiring minds of the day, if they are not to turn away from Theosophy, as they have from Christianity and other religions. We, as H. P. B., have to deal with the mind of the century as we find it. William Q. Judge characterized the

analytical method and mode of thought typified by modern science as "the *thought-form* of the age," pointing out that H. P. B.'s *Secret Doctrine* is addressed to the scientific mind. So, in considering modern social conditions we have need, not only of pointing to the underlying moral law, but of showing to the greatest possible extent the *how* of the operation of that law in terms of cyclic evolution and Karma.

The man-made law of government involving "the authoritative regulation of social relations" is supposed by present-day social science to have been evolved during the passage of mankind from a primitive, animal-like existence to the crudely organized life of the first communities. This alleged transition is hopelessly mixed up with anthropological speculations and sociological theories on the origins of customs, traditions and religious ideas. It is generally believed that modern codes, both legal and moral, began with tribal customs which were originally mere biological adaptations to environment. Then, having been established as "habits" and passed on from generation to generation, these "folkways" or "mores" were rationalized in terms of purpose and ideals. The development of reflective capacities led to a criticism of blind custom according to the prevailing criteria, religious and otherwise—and thus have been evolved our modern conceptions of morality, justice, and the function of government.

The great error made by the science of anthropology is in interpreting the customs and minds of ancient peoples in terms of what is thought to be modern knowledge. Writers unhesitatingly assume that the early races of mankind were the direct descendants of some primitive animal, and that whatever was known or believed by them was the result of simple physical experience arising out of the "struggle for existence." The universal tradition of Divine Instructors who were, "from the first awakening of human consciousness, the guides of early Humanity," is uniformly ignored or explained away as a "primitive dream." How, then, is it possible for modern scholars to understand the natural fitness of early tradition—outrageously "undemocratic" as it seems to us—which determined the individual's responsibility and power according to his station in life. We look upon the indissoluble bond between civil and religious law in every ancient system as violating the all-important principle of freedom of conscience. Hereditary inequalities sustained by law through generations are to the modern political philosopher the very essence of tyranny. Yet all these things

have their root in nature, both physical and divine, and in the natural interrelation between the two. In the darkness of Kali Yuga, when the Brahmin lives in the body of a Sudra, when Vaishyas and outcastes sit in high places, and all recorded history is the story of "confusion of caste" on every plane of human life, how could a science, the data of which is drawn exclusively from this period, think other than it does? A sad truth was uttered by Goethe—

> My friend, the golden age hath passed away,
> Only the good have the power to bring it back . . .

A fundamental difference between ancient and modern law is in the principles on which they are based. Today, in keeping with democratic philosophy, all citizens are regarded as equal before the law—this at least is the theory—the contract being the basic instrument of justice. Government is a contract between the governors and the governed. The mechanics of industry, of commerce, even of social institutions such as marriage, are all implemented by the contract. This, it will be seen, is a bargaining theory of human relations, rooted in certain fundamental misconceptions of the nature of things. It presumes, for example, that self-interest is the primary motive in existence, that the "survival of the fittest" as a law of nature has its natural translation into "competition" in the field of economics. The prevailing theory of morality, in scientific as in religious thought, is that of the utilitarians. The "good Christian" barters his virtues for salvation. Lecky, describing this position, aptly puts it: "To gain heaven and avoid hell should be the spring of all our actions, and virtue is simply prudence extending its calculations beyond the grave." A modern biologist, Raymond Pearl, regards the quality of Altruism as a rather lately developed social adaptation which man "for secondary reasons superimposed upon his natural, protoplasmic will-to-live." Its development is sometimes suspected to be a dangerous tendency which may interfere with the natural biological selfishness of man and therefore with his normal evolution.

Whatever significance be read into present-day legal forms, it is quite evident that their primary function, practically speaking, is to regulate the actions of beings whose short-sighted selfishness would otherwise overwhelm and destroy society. The spirit of modern democracy takes as its text the maxim of Hucheson, the English moral philosopher: "That action is best which procures the greatest happiness for the greatest numbers"—called by Bentham a "sacred truth," and the "foundation of morals and legislation."

Admitting this, we come to a profound problem: How shall we reduce to uniformity the widely diverse opinions as to what "happiness" is and how it is best obtained? Modern democracy seeks to serve the greatest number through the rule of popular majority. The government of the United States, for example, was planned and put into effect by representatives chosen by the people. These representatives drew up the terms of the contract by which the people vested in the governors certain authority and powers, defining the nature, extent and limits of that authority, and the means by which it might be altered. Here, again, the principle of "barter" is the underlying fundamental. The citizens exchange a theoretical "right" to unlimited freedom of action in their "pursuit of happiness" for a superimposed order provided by the constituted authority. But fearful that the governors will turn their prerogatives to the same sort of self-interest that the people as a whole have surrendered, various guarantees of individual "rights" are established by law to guard against such an eventuality.

Democracy, therefore, may be defined as that form of government under which each man may do as he pleases, within certain limits arbitrarily set by law. In a truly democratic society a man is free to act as he chooses, physically, mentally, morally, provided he does not overstep the bounds which have been commonly agreed upon by the people. Democracy, however, offers no ideals except that of freedom. Our democracy is incompetent to make answer to the man who asks, How shall I employ my freedom, and to what end? It can neither dictate nor suggest.

The modern conception of the duty of social authority or government is described in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (14th ed.), as follows:

> (*a*) To utilize the collective resources for the promotion of the good of the associated members in the sense of securing to each individual the minimum facilities for the fulfilment of his capacities for good.
>
> (*b*) To control such differences in power and possessions as arise in a society with the object of preventing those who have acquired excess of power from abusing it and forcing others into conditions incompatible with the good life. (Art. "Social Philosophy.")

Government which seeks to extend its functions beyond the limits of this definition is, in our day, in danger of becoming tyrannical. There are as many conceptions of "the good life" as there are people to conceive them. So long as "the complexities

of human life and the nature of the ends to which we ascribe values make it practically impossible for the State to intervene effectively except to secure the barest and crudest conditions of general welfare," so long must we be satisfied with a purely negative government. As another writer has put it, "The essence of the liberal doctrine is that the problem of deciding which are the experts is insoluble, both because absolute knowledge does not exist, and because even if it did exist there is no one who is not himself *sub judice* to determine which is Absolutely true."

A great conceit of modern civilization is that the ancients by no possibility could have known truths to which present thinkers are blind. Because it is quite evident to all that our society possesses not a single fundamental verity about life, the highest political ideal of our age may be phrased in this wise: "Nobody knows—but each one is entitled to his own guess, and as it would be unjust for one man's guessing to interfere with any other's, we will place certain arbitrary limits upon human action for our common protection."

Assuming that ultimate truth is undiscoverable, then Democracy as we know it appears as the only rational form of government. But supposing that Absolute Truth *does* exist, then, certainly it should be the first and foremost part of the government to promulgate true ideas. Mere possession of truth by a governing body, however, is quite different from a broad recognition of that truth on the part of the people. If the former were all that is necessary, the Masters would quickly assume the reins of government in every land, establish schools of the ancient wisdom in each community and the golden age would be born again at once. That They do not so intervene illustrates their knowledge of the principle that Mankind can evolve only through voluntary effort. Thus, in a practical sense, the reality of truth for any society is not determined by the abstract question of whether or not such truth exists, by the *idea of truth* held by the majority of citizens. Among a race whose philosophy is agnostic materialism the wise man cries in the wilderness.

From this point of view it becomes evident that if we interpret "democracy" to mean the "general will" of the people, then every form of government is democratic, as an expression of the will of the people at a certain level of intellectual and moral development. Nations which submit to dictatorship have, in a negative sense, willed to be ruled in this fashion. The idea of the absolute sov-

ereignty of a monarch in whom supreme authority and coercive power are vested has rightly been termed "no more than a convenient fiction of jurisprudence." A general without an obedient army is no longer a general—he is only a man.

Of course, at any given point of time in history one is able to point out governments which were or are clearly in opposition to the general will. These, however, are always adjusted sooner or later to the people—to their enlightened intelligence, or to their apathy, as the case may be. But to regard these exceptions as invalidating the general rule, is, in the words of H. P. B., to "mix up an abstract representation of the whole with its casual changes of form."

Present-day democracies tend to take the form of an *ochlocracy* —rule of mob. Reference to the political speeches of politicians in any of the modern democracies quickly reveals the subservience of government to popular prejudice. The endeavors of idealist statesmen to commit their government to a policy transcending mere national selfishness are almost always thwarted by demogogues who feed the fires of self-interest in the masses. This results in a government the intelligence of which is no greater than the national average—a government which, as the Greeks predicted long ago, can end only in barbarous tyranny or actual anarchy.

How is modern democracy to avoid such a fate? It has already overtaken more than one European nation, and America has numerous Jeremiahs who predict that "it can happen here" as well. One thing is certain: the use of force to reclaim the fading laurels of democratic government would destroy whatever measure of democratic freedom we still possess. This is the puzzling enigma which has frustrated modern political philosophers. The very fabric of our society is rotting before their eyes; and the only instrument of reform of admitted effectiveness, namely, *force*, they know from experience can only rend the cloth to shreds. There is but one conclusion possible:

Humanitarian motives and agnostic philosophy are utterly and completely incompatible, in theory and in practice. Together the two have hastened mankind to the brink of moral and physical destruction.

IMMORTALITY—CONDITIONAL

IN an article by Madame Blavatsky entitled "Psychic and Noetic Action," it is taught that the atoms making up the body may be energized by the noetic force of the Divine Individuality, or by the psychic force coming from the lower consciousness. The impulse given by psychic force acts from *without within,* while that of noetic force works from *within without.*

> For, as our body is the covering of the inner "principles," soul, mind, life, etc., so the molecule or the cell is the body in which dwell its "principles," the (to our senses and comprehension) immaterial atoms which compose that cell. The cell's activity and behavior are determined by its being propelled either inwardly or outwardly, by the noetic or the psychic Force, the former having no relation to the *physical* cells proper. Therefore, while the latter act under the unavoidable law of the conservation and correlation of physical energy, the atoms—being psycho-spiritual, *not physical units—act under laws of their own,* . . .

From this it appears that the physical and astral bodies are subject to a dual influence. It is only when the noetic influence is firmly established that the lower quaternary is under the control of the Divine Ego. The power to cope with the vital currents beating against the cells and organs of the body is enhanced as the inner force becomes master of the material aspects of life. Not only does better health result, but the span of earthly existence is substantially increased. By the same token, ill health results and the span of bodily existence may be curtailed, should the force affecting the "lives" and cells be psychic and kamic. As the ruling factor in life today is *Kama,* or personal ambition and desire, the race body is weak, susceptible to all sorts of ills, and subject to premature decay. So, even physical health is in the last analysis dependent upon that harmony and control which derives from the Immortal Spirit.

Noetic action not only refines the physical atoms, but has an even more marked effect on another sheath of the Soul—the astral body. In the ordinary man, the astral body is inextricably enmeshed in the physical, cell for cell, fibre for fibre. As the student practices Raja Yoga, or noetic action, the astral body begins an independent development. The inner organs "awake" and commence to separate themselves from passive bondage to their bodily counterparts. In his article, "Culture of Concentration," Mr. Judge states:

> In the course of the growth of this ethereal body several things are to be observed.
>
> It begins by having a cloudy, wavering appearance, with certain centres of energy caused by the incipiency of organs that correspond to the brain, heart, lungs, spleen, liver, and so on. It follows the same course of development as a solar system, and is in fact, *governed and influenced by the very solar system to which the world belongs on which the being may be incarnate.* With us it is governed by our own solar orb.
>
> If the practice of concentration be kept up, this cloudy mass begins to gain coherence and to shape itself into a body with different organs . . . .
>
> Certain hindrances then begin to manifest themselves which, when properly understood by us, will give us good substantial reasons for the practicing of the several virtues enjoined in our books and naturally included under the term of Universal Brotherhood.

He then describes the effects of various emotions—anger, envy, vanity and fear, on the newly forming astral body. These feelings undo what has painfully been accomplished through the practice of the Paramitas. Anger will produce a sort of explosion, the fragments flying back into the body and taking on their former entanglements. Envy will cause the astral body to take a cloudy and disagreeable color, the precursor of putrefaction. From this we can see how immediately responsive the astral vehicle is to the Kamic nature, as also to the Divine Ego.

The astral body built up through the culture of concentration becomes the permanent possession of the Ego. As stated in *The Voice of the Silence:* "The Bodhisattva develops it in himself as he proceeds on the Path." It finally becomes the glorious vesture of the Nirmanakaya—"the Divine Form as including all forms." In this we can see practically demonstrated the occult maxim that man is the microcosm and epitome of the Universe.

Immortality is not a gift, but must be striven after and won by every mortal man. Mere imperishability is not immortality—the latter term indicating the definite conquest by the Imortal Essence of the ever-changing aspects of life. The Permanent Astral Body serves its possessor for the entire cycle of evolution. From the point of view of the continuity of individual consciousness, psychic action leads to death, while noetic action leads to Immortality.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS' FORUM

IN Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita (*p. 3*), *Mr. Judge says that "Before the Upanishads can be properly rendered, the Indian psychological system must be understood." What is this system?*

The universal concepts upon which the Indian psychological system is based, and which are contained in the modern presentation of Theosophy, may be simply stated: Man as Spirit; the one Spirit in Nature; the unity of all life in that all are beings of identical spiritual essence; and the laws of the psychical and physical phenomena which accompany manifested existence.

At the outset the student sharpens his discrimination as to what is real in life and what is fleeting. He finds that all Nature exists but for the experience and emancipation of the soul. Not only this, but he engages in an active practice of the virtues. This system awakens in the heart and mind a faith (based upon knowledge) in the law and the orderly progress of life. The body is recognized as the instrument of the mind, and the mind, in turn, as servant of the soul. If altruism goes hand in hand with effort to lift the veils that shroud the purpose of life, the student comes at last to wisdom.

> By concentrating his mind upon the true nature of the soul as being entirely distinct from any experiences, and disconnected from all material things, and dissociated from the understanding, a knowledge of the true nature of the soul itself arises in the ascetic.
>
> . . . The mind, when united with the soul and fully conversant with knowledge, embraces universally all objects. *(The Yoga Aphorisms of Patanjali.)*

It is often said that the chief defect of modern education is that it provides no moral training for the young. Is not this inevitable in a country which has no official religion? Would it be against the Constitution to teach either Christianity or Theosophy in the public schools?

(*a*) The first amendment to the Constitution states: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . . "

The third item under the sixth article of the constitution reads as follows:

> The Senators and Representatives and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be

> bound by oath or affirmation, to support the Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

Why did the founders of our country insist upon religious freedom? They knew from bitter experience that encouragement by secular authority of one particular sect or creed inevitably begets intolerance, perpetual strife and jealousy. The history of New England, the land of the persecuted pilgrims, as well as of the colonies where the Church of England maintained its superiority, furnished a disgraceful chapter of dark bigotry to our annals.

Can Christianity be taught in the public schools under our Constitution?

An amplification of the first amendment is provided in the *Corpus Juris* (XII, 941-2):

> These provisions effectually guarantee the religious liberty of the individual against infringement by the federal government. They constitute, however, no protection against action by the states; and thus leave the states free to enact such laws as they may deem proper in respect to religion, restrained only by limitations of their own respective constitutions. Most of the state constitutions guarantee to the individual, irrespective of sect or denomination, protection of the rights of conscience and liberty to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

It must be noted that only "most" of the states guarantee religious freedom. In states not affording this right, Christianity or any creed or dogma may be taught legally in the public schools. Even in states where this guarantee exists, many infringements have occurred, the law either being ignored or loopholes found in it. For example, statutes designating Sunday as a day of rest and prohibiting specified acts on that day are considered as a constitutional exercise of the police power. The mere reading of a particular version of the Bible without comment has been held not to constitute an infringement of the constitutional guarantee. In Massachusetts (Thurston v. Whitney) the provisions of the constitutional guarantee of religious liberty have been declared to be not violated by the rejection of a witness as incompetent by reason of his want of religious belief. Judge Wilde held:

> It [the provision] was intended to prevent persecution by punishing any one for his religious opinions however erroneous they might be. But an atheist is without any religion, true or false. The disbelief in the existence of any God, is not a religious but a anti-religious sentiment.

Supposing for the moment that the true intent of the founders of our government had been carried out in all the states, could Theosophy be taught in the public schools?

Some excerpts from the Official Report on which was granted a Decree of Incorporation to the St. Louis Theosophical Society express the legal status of Theosophical work as established by an American Court of Law:

> The petitioner is not a religious body. . . . Merely to teach a religion as one may teach algebra, is not, I think, a religious work. . . . A man may occupy a collegiate chair of Professor of Religions and as such teach the tenets of many religions. These different religions being variant and antagonistic, the professor could not by any possibility worship under all. . . . It will be noted that in Art. 2 of the Society's constitution, the word religion is used in the plural. To teach religions is educational, not religious. "To promote the study of religions" is in part to promote the study of the history of man. I add the subordinate finding that the Society has no religious creed and practices no worship. . . .

The motto of the Theosophical Movement is, "There is no religion higher than Truth." Do the laws of our nation, state or municipality prohibit the promulgation of such an ideal?

(*b*) While the United States, so far as the formal law is concerned, has no state religion, it cannot be denied that the nation tacitly regards itself as "Christian." Christianity is implicitly recognized by the government and will probably remain so until the beliefs and traditions of the citizens are changed. Although the Constitution provides for freedom of religion, at the time it was written it probably referred to freedom to worship according to any of the many prevailing Christian sects. This meant freedom of religion, practically speaking, since almost all were Christians.

Today, as then, therefore, the President takes his oath of office under the guidance of the Christian God, on the Christian Bible, and every session of Congress is opened by prayer to the Christian God. In the courts of the nation all witnesses are bound on the Christian Bible to state the truth. In the schools the students are graduated under prayer to the Christian God and are continually subjected to Christian ideas in one form or another. So it cannot be said that there is true freedom of religion in the United States or that the nation has not in some aspects a state religion.

But suppose that the situation were reversed, with theosophists in the majority. Granted that Theosophy is true religion, would

it be just for Theosophy to assume the role Christianity is playing? Never! Every individual has the right to think as he wishes and no authority, whether of government or individual, has the right to force any religious belief upon him. If Theosophy were to become a "state religion," it would no longer be *Theosophy*.

(*c*) Theosophy is only for those who want it and for none else. An attempt at forcing some one to digest something he does not want creates confusion and hate and never really succeeds anyway. Theosophists know this and do not, therefore, waste time and energy trying to gain proselytes.

While Christians have succeeded more or less in mixing a personal god with modern education, it is widely admitted that the young in this country have no real moral training. Thus we can see that if an illogical faith is officially and deliberately taught to children in public schools, true morals will be more remote than ever. If true religion is taught in public schools, for those who want it, then all will be satisfied, for True Religion does not force anyone to blind belief. On the contrary it arouses independent judgment and discrimination. Thus True Religion (Theosophy) is the only way that the ideals implicit in the Declaration of Independence and Constitution can be carried out.

The methods used by orthodox religions would necessitate the use of force if any of them were to become the official religion for schools in general, for what scholar wants to study an unscientific, dogmatic, and irreligious religion?

But is Theosophy *a* religion? No; it is truth about philosophy, mathematics, history, theology, biology, astronomy, physics, chemistry, geology, and all the other subjects taught in schools. Theosophy is just the subject to be taught in schools, and some day, if there are enough True Theosophists, there will be Theosophical schools. There is no law that says a system of science cannot be studied, as such, and if enough students demand the study and teaching of the Science of Theosophy, classes could be started, even in "Christian" Universities. The University of California in Los Angeles already has a voluntary Theosophical study group.

Perhaps, some day, when the United States adopts a declaration similar to those of Theosophy School and U. L. T., real moral training will be available to every youngster in the United States.

PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY

THE philosophy of a man, according to the dictionary, "is an integrated and consistent personal attitude toward life or reality, especially if this attitude is expressed in beliefs and principles of conduct." Here the word philosophy is not used in a strict sense, nor does it necessarily imply something lofty or ideal, but rather the idea of the values which govern one's life—a "credo," whether or not consciously formulated. It follows, then, that the philosophy of a people lies in the collective attitude towards life assumed by the great majority of a race or people.

The philosophy of a race pervades and colors every branch of its activities—its government, its ideas of science, of religion, and all other subjects—and as "Race-Karma influences each unit in the race through the law of Distribution," all men that are born in a race, with a single exception to be considered later, are limited in their development by that Karma. W. Q. Judge wrote on this subject in *Letters That Have Helped Me*:

> Race influences are insidious and powerful. For instance, my race has its peculiarities deeply seated and inherited from an extraordinary past . . . In another life I might have been a prosaic Hottentot, or an Englishman, and in a succeeding one I might be under the influence of other race peculiarities.

According to *The Secret Doctrine* (I, 326-7):

> . . . idealistic as well as realistic thinkers, and even free-thinkers, are but the outcome and the natural product of their respective environments and periods. The ideals of both are only the necessary results of their temperaments, and the outcome of that phase of intellectual progress to which a nation, in its collectivity, has attained.

The same law is discussed in the *Aphorisms on Karma*, (14 and 15), and in Patanjali's *Yoga Aphorisms* (IV, sec. 8).

Consideration of this phase of Karma shows that the so-called "leading minds" of the race, being the best it can produce, represent in their own conceptions and ideas the efflorescence of the whole—the race philosophy. We can observe the influence of western "practical philosophy" especially in education. And as educational methods are theoretically predicated on modern psychology, the relation between philosophy and the latter is of particular interest.

Psychology, according to the *Theosophical Glossary*, is—

> The Science of Soul, in days of old: a Science which served as the unavoidable basis for physiology. Whereas in our modern

> day, it is psychology that is being based (by our *great* scientists) upon physiology.

The philosophy of the West can be stated in four simple words—"I am my body." Our psychologists reflect this philosophy in all their undertakings, as is revealed by a brief review of the various schools of psychology.

Because of her mechanistic methods, science has arrived at a blank wall of negation and futility, with the result that many of her devotees are now turning to the subjective world, expressly seeking for the "operator" of the mind, rather than experimenting with the mechanics of its operation. But like the man who, having faced in the right direction, proceeded to walk backwards, so in setting out on this new avenue of research our psychologists have begun with the premise that the subjective world is a product of the objective!

Whence this treacherous philosophy of materialism? In the early days of our evolution, it is said, the Unity of Life was apparent to all and the powers of spirit well known. But as we descended the stair of increasing materiality of form, what was only the *appearance* of separateness became a psychological reality. The very effort to make his physical instrument a fit dwelling for the ego caused man to place his entire consciousness below in the lower man. Lost in a maze of physical sensation, his divine purpose was entirely forgotten.

How can man regain his lost heritage? There is, as was noted, one exception to the general rule that a man's ideas and ideals are limited by the intellectual development of his race. Such exceptions can be found in every period of history—beings who are not "products of their environment," who bring to and maintain through birth and death a knowledge of the whole truth, who come for the sole purpose of awakening man out of his lethargic slumber of ignorance, and to point the way whereby all may themselves become emancipated from the bonds of conditioned existence.

To the degree that man avails himself of Their compassionate aid and succeeds in following the path they show, to that degree does he become "initiated"—able to break the shackles of personal or racial Karma. A permanent nucleus of such determined souls, living in the midst of humanity, can be the focus of a force that will move the world. Once the people adopt eternal truth as the basis for their philosophy, every branch of human activity will undergo a glorious transformation.

ON THE LOOKOUT

The Source of Mental Energy

Modern scientific studies in the nature and activities of the mind are discussed by George W. Gray in *Harper's* for April. Titling his observations as the "Chemical Foundations of Mind," he tells of experiments establishing the basic minimum of energy necessary to keep the body alive. Energy consumption over this minimum varies with the activity in which the subject is engaged. The great fatigue caused by the use of mental powers led to a search for the source from which the mind draws its energy. To this end the effects on the body of mental exercise, as indicated by respiration, generation of heat, etc., were studied. The metabolism was measured with the body at rest, when at attention, and when performing an intellectual act such as working a mathematical problem. At the end of a morning's testing all the subjects felt extreme fatigue, yet the requirements of the body during the periods of rest, as compared with those of mental activity, were almost the same. A slight increase in heart and lung action indicated an added consumption of oxygen, but the rate of body metabolism was not noticeably altered.

The question arises: Does the mind draw on a source other than the physical body for its nourishment? The writer declares that the number of brain cells which function in mental effort constitute but approximately one hundredth part of one per cent of the weight of the entire body, reasoning that therefore their exercise would not alter metabolism materially. However this may be, we know that the intuitive knowledge shown by men of genius originates in a way that seems essentially independent of sense perception. Why may not the "food" of the mind have also a superphysical origin?

Brain Waves

Mr. Gray describes experiments showing the electrical properties of brain action. Delicate instruments reveal that several types of waves emanate from the brain. First are the *alpha* waves, which furnish the predominant rhythm. Superimposed on these are *beta* waves, of shorter wave-length and higher frequency. Pulsations of irregular wave-lengths and uncertain rhythm originate in the cerebral cortex, the center of reason and creative thinking. The

waves coming from the brain of one asleep vary from those of one awake, and during mental activity still further variations are noticeable.

These electric "thought patterns" are empirical evidence supporting the statements made on the subject of the brain in *The Ocean of Theosophy*. Mr. Judge writes: " . . . the human brain is an exhaustless generator of force." "Man is a great dynamo, making, storing, and throwing out energy, and when masses of men composing a race thus make and distribute energy, there is a resulting dynamic effect on the material of the globe which will be powerful enough to be distinct and cataclysmic." In this connection readers may find of interest a quotation from a scientific work of the last century—*The Earth as Modified by Human Action*, written by George P. Marsh and first published in New York in 1863:

> No atom can be disturbed in space, or undergo any change of temperature, of electrical state, or other material condition, without affecting, by attraction or repulsion or other communication, the surrounding atoms. These, again, by the same law, transmit the influence to other atoms, and the impulse thus given extends through the whole material universe. Every human movement, every organic act, every volition, passion, or emotion, every intellectual process, affects all the atoms of universal matter. Though action and reaction are equal, yet reaction does not restore disturbed atoms to their former place and condition, and consequently the effects of the least material change are never cancelled, but in some way perpetuated, so that no action can take place in physical, moral, or intellectual nature, without leaving all matter in a different state from what it would have been if such action had not occurred. Hence . . . there exists . . . in external nature, an ineffaceable, imperishable record, possibly legible even to created intelligence, of every act done, every word uttered, nay, of every wish and purpose and thought conceived by mortal man, from the birth of our first parent to the final extinction of our race; so that the physical traces of our most secret sins shall last until time shall be merged in that eternity of which not science, but religion alone, assumes to take cognizance. (p. 643-4.)

Chemical Psychology

Unfortunately, few scientists of the present generation are concerned with the implications of this kind that lie along the path of their investigations. Some day, instead of considering the "Chem-

ical Foundations of Mind," they may turn to the "Mental Foundations of Chemicals," and make some astounding discoveries. Albert P. Matthews of the University of Cincinnati, writing on "Chemistry and Psychism" in Cowdry's *General Cytology*, is intuitively prophetic when he says—

> The psychologist of the future will discuss the psychology of hydrogen, of oxygen, indeed that of the electrons, positive and negative, themselves. For who can doubt that those properties of the atoms which show themselves in the psychical phenomena of living things are also present in the same atoms in the inorganic form? For the atoms are the same in living and lifeless, and every moment they are turning from the one to the other. As DuBois Reymond put it, the atoms of iron in the great driving wheel of the locomotive and in the brain of the poet are the same.
>
> We cannot understand chemistry, therefore, and certainly not biochemistry, the chemistry of cells, until the relation between material and psychic things is worked out . . . We must leave out, because of our ignorance, the psychic side of chemical reactions. Our equations, therefore, will be as incomplete as if energy were omitted. The transformation of matter and energy alone can be considered . . . which becomes hence like Hamlet with Hamlet left out. Let us not blind ourselves to this fact.

SELF-CREATING ACTIVITY

A deeply interesting conclusion arrived at by Dr. Hallowell Davis of the Harvard Medical School, one of the leaders in brain-wave research, is quoted by the *Harper's* writer:

> Many of us have thought of the nervous system as a great silent network of neurons activated only in response to sensory stimulation. We must now enlarge our thinking by assuming a constant background of pre-existing and probably self-creating activity.

Does Dr. Davis here recant the fundamental assumption of modern psychological research: the strict predetermination of every human thought and act as nothing more than automatic responses to stimuli—hapless links in an inexorable chain of cause and effect?

"FREE WILL" ACCORDING TO SCIENCE

Max Planck, discussing the question of Free Will in a book of essays, *Where is Science Going?* points out the position of Psychology:

> The dependence of each event upon preceding fact and preparatory factors gradually begins to appear under the strong light of scientific investigation, so much so as to warrant the statement that present day scientific procedure in psychology is founded practically exclusively on the principle of causal relations and the assumption of an active law of causality which permits no exceptions. This means the postulate of complete determinism is accepted as a necessary condition for the progress of psychological research.

The great physicist then asks the question:

> In the midst of a world where the principle of causation prevails universally, what room is there for the autonomy of human volition? This is an important question, especially today, because of a widespread tendency to extend the tenets of scientific determinism to human conduct and thus shelve responsibility from the shoulders of the individual. We have had an example of this in some modern interpreters of historical development who would hold that the destiny of a group of individuals, forming a nation or a civilization, is determined by blind fate. Therefore in the last analysis the responsibility for such a destiny does not rest with the individual. Is this attitude a legitimate deduction . . . ? . . . amid the all-around causal sequence in natural phenomena is there still room for the free and responsible act of the will of the individual? . . . Is there something in the nature of man, some inner realm, that science cannot touch? Is it so that when we approach the inner springs of human action science cannot have the last word? Or, to speak more concretely, is there a point at which the causal line of thought ceases and beyond which science cannot go?

"The Freedom of the Ego"

In a brief paragraph Prof. Planck meets these searching questions with a solution that should be deeply satisfying to students of Theosophy. He calls it "The Answer of Science." Were this the acknowledged fact, instead of the intuitive perception of a great mind, there would indeed be cause for rejoicing. He writes:

> The fact is that there is a point, one single point in the immeasurable world of mind and matter, where science and therefore every causal method of research is inapplicable, not only on practical grounds but also on logical grounds, and will always remain inapplicable. This point is the individual ego. It is a small point in the universal realm of beings; but in itself it is a whole world, embracing our emotional life, our will and our

> thought. This realm of the ego is at once the source of our deepest suffering and at the same time of our highest happiness. Over this realm no outer power of fate can ever have sway, and we lay aside our control and responsibility over ourselves only with the laying aside of life itself . . . the freedom of the ego here and now, and its independence of the causal chain, is a truth that comes from the immediate dictate of the human consciousness.

The profound significance behind these ideas is expressed by H. P. B. in a few short sentences:

THE ANCIENT VIEW

> . . . if the Parabrahmam of the Hindus may be taken as a representative of the hidden and nameless deities of other nations, this absolute Principle will be found to be the prototype from which all the others were copied. Parabrahm is not "God," because It is not *a* God. "It is that which is supreme, and not supreme (paravara)," explains Mandukya Upanishad (2.28). IT is "Supreme" as CAUSE, not supreme as effect. (*S. D.* I, 6.)

Thus, the "Ego" which Prof. Planck calls "inviolable" by the law of causation, is so in that as Parabrahmam it is the *origin* of all causation—*supreme* as cause; while in the manifested universe that same Ego is "not supreme" as effect, but must suffer the results of its actions. Planck quotes the German philosopher, Hermann Lotze, who raised the suggestion that motives can appear entirely independently, not caused by any preceding influence, it following that "the conduct to which these motives lead will be the first link in a new chain." This doctrine Lotze applied particularly to creative geniuses. Such speculations lead directly to a profound field of Theosophical inquiry—the doctrine of Karma and Nirvana, the relation of Mahatmas to the Law which they embody, and the peculiar use made of the power of choice by these Great Beings.

A NEW "CRIMINAL TYPE"

The United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company of Baltimore has made a study of the lives of 400 women embezzlers, from which the following "average" is derived (New York *Times*, May 30):

> She is a married woman of about 35½ years who worked in a mercantile establishment for five and one-half years. She has nothing whatever in common with the criminal type—the "gun moll," the cabaret "hostess" or the shady woman tramp. She is

> rooted in the community and respected by her neighbors. She does not drink, gamble or speculate. She is fairly intelligent and a good worker. She has not known grinding poverty, but she has known what it is to want what she could not honestly obtain.
>
> Why did this woman embezzle from her employer—this woman in the neat and respectable home? This is what the figures for the 400 women embezzlers show. She stole to cover the incompetence and irresponsibility of her husand. He had failed to provide what she thought she and the family must have.

Some American "Ideals"

Reading between the lines of the report, the writer sees an industrious wife and worker, seemingly contented, but secretly eaten by social ambition and desire for the expensive gadgets that her husband, through inefficiency or incompetence, cannot provide. The "just-as-good-as-you" motif emerges, and the panting chase to "keep up with the Joneses." Several tragic case histories are related from among these employes of banks, public offices, post offices, fraternal societies and mercantile establishments. The woman embezzler differs from the male offender in an important respect: "She does not visualize the pleasures of money except through providing for a man."

> The figures show that 191 of the women embezzlers were married, 139 were single, 44 were widows and 26 divorced or separated from their husbands. A total of 179 committed the embezzlements for the benefits of others, at least in part. Approximately one out of every ten—married or single alike—ran away when the theft was discovered or before. Few committed suicide.

What commentary can be written to add to this exposure of our social life? We brag of "the American Way," our "highest standard of living," and the great ideal of material prosperity. Radio, motion pictures, and those greatest of offenders, the women's magazines with their circulations of many millions, have sold the American public its ideals, and a harvest of embezzlers is the result.

Who Is Responsible?

A weird sequel to modern advertising technique is chronicled by the Princess Alexandra Kropotkin (*Liberty,* Nov. 7, 1936), indi-

cating the kind of problems our psychiatrists will face in increasing number as the suggestibility of the race develops with the cycle:

> Thank goodness only one case of the new mental disease has been reported so far. The patient—this story is true—was a woman so queerly afflicted that she couldn't resist any command she saw printed in big letters on an outdoor billboard.
>
> In a city miles from her home she wandered into a police station.
>
> "Send for my husband," she sobbed. "An awful thing has happened to me. I saw a large poster issued by a railroad company. It told me to get on a train and come here for my vacation. I haven't any vacation. I didn't want to come, but something compelled me. I just couldn't help myself."

Here, as in every phase of human activity, the extreme case illustrates the prevailing condition in the mass. "Obey that impulse," urge enticing advertisements, and a nation of well-trained consumers marks time.

BIRTH CONTROL—PRO AND CON

The American Medical Association in a recent convention at Atlantic City accorded birth control a recognized place in medical practice. (New York *Times*, June 8.) This action was the culmination of two years of extensive research and debate on this vital social problem. Licensed physicians are now within their "legal rights" when offering contraceptive service. Dr. Hans H. Reese, of Madison, Wis., now calls for thorough education of the profession on this subject. On behalf of the American Neurological Association he urges that the A. M. A. should

> . . . take up at once the matter of proper teaching of contraception at the medical schools and the organization of medically supervised contraceptive clinics in the hospitals. The time has passed for discussion and debate. The fact now remains that the physician is now free to use contraceptives in his practice and should be educated in their use.

Strong objection to this program was voiced by the Rev. Ignatius Cox, Professor of Ethics, Fordham University. Speaking for the Federation of Catholic Physicians' Guilds, he maintained that "the practice of artificial contraception for any reason is a perversion of the moral right order of things." This "order," of course, is that defined by Catholic theology. "It should be remembered," he said, "that in the quest for health there are some things of greater importance, such as the attainment of supernatural destiny." Fol-

lowing is a statement issued at the conclusion of a conference held by the Federation:

> The Federation of Catholic Physician's Guilds declares that God alone is the absolute master of man and his destiny; that man is only the responsible steward of life, individual and social, and that man is subject to the eternal laws, natural and supernatural.

Unscientific Ethics

The Catholic position in this controversy must be approved wholly apart from its doctrinal basis. Here, as in countless other cases, the contentions of the Church are undetermined by the irrational dogmas associated with the stand taken. Men of science scorn *a priori* any belief formulated from such premises, although an identical conclusion might have been arrived at through a higher form of reasoning based on a sound foundation.

Theosophical teaching on this subject is quite clear. An interference with the laws of nature is contrary to all true principles of morality, especially when the divine power of creation is profaned by mere bestial satisfaction. The Karmic effects of such unwitting abuse work to the detriment of the race and to the especial detriment of those who thus interfere with the natural evolution of egos seeking birth. The animalistic doctrine held by some psychologists and physiologists that sexual gratification, as distinct from the procreative motive, is a necessity to "uninhibited" marital life is not supported by intelligent social research. Moreover, it is generally recognized that self-indulgence of this kind leads to a loss of the higher powers of the intellect, especially those which we are accustomed to associate with the powers of intellectual or artistic creation.

The "New Freedom"

Hornell Hart, professor of social ethics at the Hartford Theological Seminary, a sociologist who has devoted much of his life to problems of child welfare, writes in *The Forum* for June on "Morals in Marriage." He comments on the breakdown of the old restraints:

> The intellectual framework of Christianity has depended on tradition and dialectic. Science has forced a thorough reconstruction of that framework. As the old system of ideas has weakened, life energies have been bursting through the sluices which once conveyed them to the powerhouse. The libertarians

> have thought: Now we shall find happiness by escaping from the behavior patterns which have hampered us! And, when they have discovered that confusion, suffering and tragedy have resulted from repudiating discipline, they have been prone to take refuge in resentful or cynical defeatism.

Dr. Hart urges the "use of one's body as one's servant, not acceptance of it as one's master."

> Hard to achieve? Certainly! It is hard to establish oneself as a successful lawyer, manufacturer, physician, banker, engineer, editor, musician, or grocer. Virile men do not lie down in poverty and failure merely because successful living is arduous . . .
>
> Nature has a way of eliminating from the cosmic pattern those decadent individuals and institutions which fail to attain sufficient integration to perpetuate themselves. As social groups, the sexual libertines are notably sterile. Each individual is brought, ineluctably, to a cosmic choice. Will he bend his energies to fulfilling his place in the emerging patterns of the universe? Or will he deposit himself on the refuse pile of discarded failure?

EUGENICS—A "SACRED IDEAL"

The writer describes the soul corrosion resulting from unrestrained sensuality and irresponsibility. His conclusions derive from no system of metaphysics but are based on practical observation in a life of social service. Liberal churchmen who renounce their traditional convictions on this subject should consult the facts of this kind revealed by sociology before rushing into print with their "enlightened" pronouncements. Birth-control is advocated by many leaders of protestant churches and Dean Inge calls eugenics, of which birth-control is a practical application, "the most sacred ideal of the human race as a race." (Quoted by Julian Huxley in *What Dare I Think?* Harper Brothers, 1931.) A superficial familiarity with scientific speculations on the subject of heredity has led these misguided clergymen to adopt doctrines fatally subversive of moral evolution. As a matter of actual fact, informed biologists assert that many of the claims made by eugenic theory are without scientific foundation and rest principally on wishful thinking. We quote Raymond Pearl, of Johns Hopkins:

> The analogy often drawn between human breeding and livestock breeding is in part specious and misleading. In animal breeding it has been learned that the only reliable measure of genetic superiority is the progeny test—the test of quality of the off-

> spring actually produced. Breeding in the light of this test may, and often does, lead to the rapid, sure, and permanent improvement of a strain of livestock. But when the results of human breeding are interpreted in the light of the clear principles of the progeny test the eugenic case does not fare so well. *In absolute numbers the vast majority of the most superior people in the world's history have in fact been produced by mediocre or inferior forebears; and furthermore the admittedly most superior folk have in the main been singularly unfortunate in their progeny, again in absolute numbers.* (Smithsonian Inst. Ann. Rept., 1935.)

In the light of this statement, we may wonder at the "logical" thought processes of Julian Huxley, who, after a detailed description of the genes and their function as the agents of physical inheritance, declares that "No basis now remains for any doctrine of metempsychosis." To use a time-honored simile, such reasoning would deny the existence of the watchmaker because some understanding has been gained of the mechanics of the timepiece.

The "Defense" of the Catholic Church

Under the pen-name of Peter Whiffin a Catholic priest wrote for the April *Forum* a forceful article entitled, "A Priest Warns The Church." He discussed the distrust shown by the Catholic poor towards the priests of their own church:

> The clergy preached pale, scholarly, sermons about moral principles of justice, but they did not become imprudently specific about concrete cases of injustice. They railed against sins like birth-control, without attacking the economic causes of these sins. They preached mealy-mouthed homilies about how blessed are the poor in being chosen to carry the cross of poverty; of such is the kingdom of heaven—while they made sure as a class that they themselves had plenty of the kingdom of this world.

Letters to *The Forum* from readers expressed varying degrees of sympathy and suspicion concerning Mr. Whiffin's motives. Many Catholics who rushed to the defense of the church asserted that he was satisfying a personal grievance by his attack on Catholic institutions. Michael Williams, editor of *The Commonweal*, replying for the Church in the June *Forum*, produces a work of considerable dramatic appeal, in which much is made of the individual self-sacrifice of certain priests. A grim threat concludes his defense of the Catholic clergy:

> All priests are warned by Mother Church of what may befall them if they do not strive to live the meaning of their vows. Over each of the myriads of priests ordained by the bishops, the warning of the church is uttered today, as it has been from remote ages and as it will until the end of time . . .
>
> And that warning holds true for other priests than Peter Whiffin.

"VICARIOUS ATONEMENT"?

In the same issue *The Forum* prints a two-page advertisement, described as paid for by "friends of Peter Whiffin," wherein that priest recants over his printed name, confessing with pious humility that "personal grievance" inspired his original article. The editors of *The Forum* deny having received word about this statement from Mr. Whiffin himself, pointing out that he recently had reaffirmed his original position in a signed letter to *America*, a leading Catholic weekly. Mr. Whiffin's alleged sudden change of heart recorded in the advertisement placed by his friends is somewhat confusing. With these facts in view the incident appears to be closed, and puzzled readers must be left to draw their own conclusions.

PROGRESS?

Dr. A. E. Wiggam (*Oakland Tribune*, Oct. 22, 1936) comments upon a statement made by a noted economist to the effect that "eighty per cent of the per capita increase in products sold since the days of our grandparents do not add to our health or happiness." Dr. Wiggam is inclined to agree, upon the recorded facts, that of our national income a sixth goes for harmful foods, smoking, drinking, doubtful amusements, gambling, cosmetics, and needless changes in style; another sixth for crime, unnecessary disease, preventable accidents, and fire losses; of the rest, an enormous proportion for war.

Suppose all this waste of effort and production were turned to the relief of the needy, to food, clothing, housing, *good* literature, and above all, to *education?* Would not the country soon be a heaven, as compared with what it is now?